

**BSU-85 RETARDER FIN
W52P1J-04-R-0091 (ATTACHMENT 14)
ADDITIONAL SOLICITATION CLAUSES**

**SECTION M EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD (BASIS FOR AWARD, FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS TO BE EVALUATED, EVALUATION APPROACH) 15.204-5(C)
OCT 1997**

M-3 The following are the evaluation factors for award:

(a) A best value, competitive, firm fixed price contract is contemplated for award. There will be a 100% evaluated option included in this award. The solicitation will be unrestricted, full and open competition.

(b) An award will be made to the offeror whose Technical Ability, recent, relevant record of Past Performance, Price and Small Business Utilization provide the best value to the Government. Recent is defined as occurring within the past three (3) years prior to the solicitation's initial closing date. In addition, the Government has the right to consider information regarding contractor performance up to the date of award. Relevant is defined as having previously produced like or similar items. Like or similar items are defined as items that have been produced utilizing similar manufacturing processes, essential skills and unique techniques needed to produce the BSU-85 Retarder Fin. A like item shall also have performed under similar performance parameters and environmental conditions as the BSU-85 Retarder Fin. The Government reserves the right to determine whether an item is like or similar and whether production quantities apply to the current requirement for evaluation purposes. Offerors shall provide a narrative explanation of how/why they believe the experience is relevant.

(c) For the purpose of the acquisition, **offeror** is defined as prime contractor and key subcontractors identified by the prime contractor.

(d) The evaluation team may determine that an on-site visit or a Capability Study of the Offeror's facility (for those offeror's determined to be in the competitive range), may be necessary for clarification purposes to confirm or clarify information in the offeror's proposal, however, offeror's are cautioned that the Government intends to award without site visits, if practical. The competitive range shall include all of the most highly rated proposals unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency.

(e) **Important Notice to Offerors:** For the purpose of this solicitation, offers must include best value data with the original proposal. Data requested for evaluation has been clearly identified in section L of the solicitation. Data submitted may represent either Government or commercial contracts; however, the data should be recent (within 3 years of the initial closing date of the solicitation; however the Government has the right to consider information up to the date of award) and relevant to the item being procured. If the offeror has no recent or relevant past performance, this information

should be stated for evaluation purposes. Discussions will not be opened for the sole purpose of allowing offerors to submit their initial best value data. Proposals received with no Best Value information may be considered unacceptable and the offeror will be rated poor and/or unknown without opening discussions to allow for the submission of data that should have been submitted with the initial proposal.

(End of Provision)

MF6012

SECTION M, EVALUATION FACTORS AND SIGNIFICANT SUBFACTORS FOR AWARD 15.304-5(C) OCT 1997

M-4 The Government expects to award a contract to that offeror whose proposal is determined to represent the "best value" to the Government. Best Value is determined by an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors. Any area of the offer requiring clarification will be referred to the Procuring Contracting Officer for resolution. The Procuring Contracting Officer reserves the right to contact offerors for clarification, without opening discussions. The Government anticipates awarding a contract without opening discussions and without a site visit.

(a) Award will be based upon the following evaluation factors:

Factor 1: Technical Ability

Subfactor 1a: Skills, Processes and Procedures

Subfactor 1b: Quality System

Subfactor 1c: Testing and Inspection

Factor 2: Past Performance

Subfactor 2a: On-Time Delivery

Subfactor 2b: Quality and/or Quality Program Problems

Factor 3: Price

Factor 4: Small Business Utilization

(b) Evaluation Factors Rankings: The following relative rankings of the evaluation factors will be used in determining the Best Value selection:

(1) Technical Ability is approximately equal to Past Performance, and when combined, they are significantly more important than Price.

(2) Small Business utilization is considered the least important factor.

(3) Within Technical Ability, the sub-factors are equal in importance; within Past Performance, the sub-factors are equal in importance

(4) Price contains no subfactors.

(5) Small Business Utilization contains no subfactors.

(c) Proposals will be rated on the basis of their response to the RFP. Only factors/sub-factors identified in Section M of the RFP and price will be evaluated. Proposals pertaining to Technical Ability and Small Business Utilization shall be evaluated only on their content. Assumptions, preconceived ideas, and personal knowledge or opinions not supported by material provided in the proposal will not be considered or used as a basis for evaluation.

(d) The Government's evaluation of Past Performance may include data/information from sources other than those provided with the offeror's proposal. Sources such as, but not limited to, contracting and pre-award offices at other commands may be used to gather information. In addition, the Government has the right to consider information regarding contractor performance up to the date of award. For the purpose of submitting past performance information, "offeror" should also include subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement, team members, partners and other entities that comprise the offer at the time of the solicitation closing date. The government will consider past performance of subcontractors identified in the offeror's proposal when assessing the offeror's Past Performance.

(e) Evaluation Factors/Process:

Factor 1: Technical Ability: The Government shall utilize the following sub-factors, to determine if the offeror and/or subcontractor has the technical knowledge, equipment, and personnel required to manufacture the product per requirements. Certifications, abilities, and/or capabilities that would demonstrate the technical expertise of the offeror to complete the product or service may also be considered. The technical rating will be determined through consideration of the individual subfactor ratings; including subfactor strengths, weaknesses, and risks; and their order of relative importance.

Subfactor 1a: Skills, Processes and Procedures (SPP): The offeror will be evaluated on their technical know how, equipment, processes and the personnel necessary to produce and deliver a quality product. Evaluators shall consider/review the following areas:

(1) The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate process controls associated with the fabrication of the retarder assembly (ballute), including stitch pattern, adhesion, and test and visual inspection requirements.

- (2) The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate process controls for metal working (stamping/forming); welding and swaging; material treatments and plating; and
- (3) The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate process control associated with critical assembly operations, including lanyard assembly and retarder assembly (ballute) packaging.

Subfactor 1b: Quality System: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to establish and maintain a quality system in accordance with solicitation requirements. The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding and ability to implement the requirements described in the Quality Assurance Provisions (QAP) 1634AS100. The offeror will be evaluated as to whether they have implemented preventive action initiatives as part of their overall Quality System. Evidence of quality awards and/or quality certifications will also be considered.

Subfactor 1c: Testing and Inspection: The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding and ability to perform the examinations and tests identified in the solicitation and technical data specifications, as well as required production rates. The offeror will also be evaluated on their understanding of the First Article Test (FAT) and Lot Acceptance Test (LAT) requirements, which form an integral part of the acceptance of the end item. A misunderstanding of the FAT and/or LAT requirements could result in an improper price quote or in a financial loss to the offeror after award. The offeror's schedule will be evaluated for reasonableness and the likelihood of execution. Reasonableness will include key tests and their duration.

Factor 2: Past Performance: The Government shall utilize the following sub-factors to evaluate the offeror's past performance. The past performance rating will be determined through consideration of the individual subfactor ratings; including subfactor strengths, weaknesses, and risks; and their order of relative importance:

Subfactor 2a: On-Time Delivery: Information provided by the offeror for recent performance on like or similar items will be evaluated. The offeror will be rated based on their record of on-time delivery. The original contract delivery schedule will be compared to the actual deliveries to determine whether deliveries were made on time. If slippages occurred, the offeror shall provide reasons why they did not meet original delivery schedules. Reasons for schedule slippages and whether a revised delivery schedule was incorporated will be considered. Accelerated deliveries or increased production rates to meet the Governments' needs will also be considered. Other sources, available to the Government other than the contractor's proposal, may be used to gather and evaluate On-Time Delivery. Sources may include, but are not limited to data gathered from pre-award offices, other major support commands, past customers, and/or previous contracting officials.

Subfactor 2b: Quality and/or Quality Program Problems: The offeror's recent performance on like or similar items in the area of quality assurance will be evaluated. In the event that problems are found, the offeror's process and timeliness to improve product quality will be considered. The offeror shall submit data explaining corrective actions taken to improve their processes and/or solve quality problems. The offeror shall disclose information about previous Requests for Waivers (RFWs), Requests for Deviations (RFDs), Quality Deficiency Reports (QDRs), First Article Test failures, lot acceptance test failures, and/or other quality or Quality Program problems. The offeror's submission must be clear and concise when describing deficiencies, stating corrective actions and timeliness of implementation. The offeror will also be evaluated on how well they worked with previous Government and technical representatives or other customers in accordance with a narrative provided about past experiences where his responsiveness, thoroughness and expertise were a significant factor in a problem's resolution. Other sources available to the Government, other than the offeror's proposal, may be used to gather and evaluate Quality and/or Quality Program Problems. Such sources are cited above.

Factor 3: Price: The proposed price will be evaluated in accordance with related factors stated in the solicitation. All evaluation factors, including total basic price, option price and Government Property and Equipment will be applied to determine total evaluated price.

Factor Factor 4: Small Business Utilization:

(1) The Government will evaluate all offerors (small, large and foreign) proposed utilization of:

- Small Business (SB)
- Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)
- Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB)
- Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB)
- Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)
- Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business (HUBZone) hereinafter all to be referred to as SB; and
- Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI).

(2) For Small Businesses, as identified by the size standard for the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) applicable to this solicitation, the offeror's own participation as a SB or HBCU/MI is to be identified and will be considered in evaluating small business utilization.

(3) The Government will evaluate the extent to which an offeror identifies and commits to utilizing SB and HBCU/MI in the performance of the proposed contract as well as how well it has performed in this regard in the past. Such utilization may be as

the contractor, a subcontractor, or as a member of a joint venture or teaming arrangement. The elements to be evaluated are:

(a) Complexity of specific products or services that will be provided by those SB's and HBCU/MI's.

(b) Estimated total dollar amount to Small Businesses, as well as in each of the Small Business categories and HBCU/MI's.

(c) Realism - The Government will evaluate the offeror's actual past performance in achieving the proposed small business utilization on contracts performed within three years prior to the initial solicitation closing date for same or similar items to assess the realism of proposed small business utilization. This evaluation will include an assessment of:

(i) The offeror's performance as prescribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clause 52.219-8, "Utilization of Small Business Concerns". SB's and HBCU/MI's are reminded to include their own performance on their contracts.

(ii) For large business offerors, their performance as prescribed by FAR 52.219-9, "Small Business Subcontracting Plan". This includes evaluation of the offeror's actual performance in meeting SB and HBCU/MI subcontracting goals. Large businesses that have not held a contract in the past three years that included FAR 52.219-9, will be evaluated against FAR 52.219-8 only.

(iii) Offerors without a record of past performance will not be considered favorably or unfavorably in developing a realism assessment. The fact that the offeror has no past performance will be noted for the Source Selection Authority.

Note: If an offeror has no Small Business Utilization Past Performance, the proposal will be evaluated on only the elements of Complexity of specific products or services that will be provided by those SB's and HBCU/MI's and Estimated total dollar amount for SBs as well as each of the Small Business categories and HBC/MI's. The proposal will be given an adjectival rating without regard to past performance, treating this lack of past performance neither favorably nor unfavorably. Such an offeror's rating will, however, note that it had no Small Business Utilization Past Performance. This will allow the Source Selection Authority to make any necessary trade-offs.

(End of Provision)

MF6025